

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending. Claims 1 and 4 are the only independent claims.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,915,001 (Uppaluru). Applicant traverses and submits that the independent claims are patentable over Uppaluru for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a contents inspecting system for inspecting contents accumulated in a server and consisting of at least HTML (hypertext markup language) data by means of a terminal apparatus. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, storage means in a server for storing: (a) contents accumulated in a server, the contents having associated therewith voice data for explaining an outline of the contents, and (b) an exclusive tag that indicates that the voice data is present at the server.

The exclusive tag, for example, indicates to the browser that the server has available for downloading voice data that explains the contents, for example of the Web page.

On the other hand, Uppaluru relates to a system for accessing voice files, for example for use in an interactive voice response system or voice mail system. In the Office Action, the Examiner took the position that Col. 8, lines 11-13 and Col. 5, lines 42-45 of Uppaluru show the recited exclusive tag. The position was also taken that Col. 8, lines 17-21 and 25-29 of Uppaluru show the recited voice data for explaining an outline of the contents. This is not correct.

First, the exclusive tag, as recited, indicates that the *recited* voice data is present. The voice tags of Uppaluru do not provide such an indication. The voice tags of Uppaluru are a way of presenting voice information in the voice Web system of Uppaluru. There is no teaching that they *indicate* that voice data exists that corresponds to contents, e.g., of a Web

page, still less that they *indicate* that voice data *for explaining an outline of the contents* is present. For at least this reason, no prima facie case of anticipation has been established.

Moreover, pre-recorded voice prompts, which were relied upon by the Examiner as allegedly corresponding to the recited voice data for explaining an outline of said contents, do not meet that feature of claim 1. There is no teaching in Uppaluru that the voice prompts explain an outline of the contents. The fact that a voice prompt may *relate in some undisclosed way* to the contents does not meet this feature of the claim.

To make a prima facie case of anticipation requires that each feature of the claim be found in a single reference, combined exactly as in the claim. For at least the above-noted reasons, no prima facie case has been established. Independent claim 4 recites features substantially similar to those mentioned above in connection with claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: September 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant